

**MAKAREM & ASSOCIATES APLC**  
 Ronald W. Makarem, Esq. (Cal. Bar No. 180442)  
 11601 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2440  
 Los Angeles, California 90025-1760  
 Phone: (310) 312-0299; Fax: (310) 312-0296

Attorneys for Debtor JAMES CANNON

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**  
**EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, FRESNO DIVISION**

*In re* JAMES FLOYD CANNON and  
 JAMIE DARLENE CANNON,  
  
 Debtors.

Case No.: 15-bk-11835  
 DC No.: RWM-1  
 Chapter 7

Hon. Fredrick E. Clement

**DECLARATION OF RONALD MAKAREM  
 IN SUPPORT OF DEBTOR'S  
 APPLICATION TO REOPEN CASE**

**Ex Parte Hearing**

Date: *not set*  
 Time: *not set*  
 Place: *not set*

**MAKAREM DECLARATION**

I, Ronald Makarem, declare and state as follows:

1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in all of the courts of the State of California and in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. I am an attorney at Makarem & Associates APLC, which represents Debtor in state-court litigation and in this Court for the limited purpose set forth below. I have personal knowledge of each of the facts set forth herein, except where indicated otherwise. If called upon to do so, I could and would testify competently thereto.

2. I represent Debtor James Cannon in connection with legal malpractice claims alleged against his former Chapter 13 and Chapter 7 bankruptcy counsel, Robert Williams. I do not practice bankruptcy law and do not represent Mr. Cannon in connection with his bankruptcy. Due to my experience in the legal malpractice field, however, I am aware of the federal common law *Barton* doctrine, which in certain circumstances deprives a state court from exercising jurisdiction over a lawsuit that potentially affects the administration of a bankruptcy estate. If the *Barton* doctrine applies, leave of the bankruptcy court is required in order to litigate a matter in state court.

3. Based on my firm's research and my discussions with other legal malpractice practitioners, it is my understanding that the *Barton* doctrine potentially applies after the bankruptcy case has been closed in lawsuits against a trustee, court-approved counsel, or debtor-in-possession's counsel. To date, I have not located any precedential Ninth Circuit opinion, or published district court decision within the Ninth Circuit, that addresses whether the *Barton* doctrine applies in a lawsuit brought against a debtor's former Chapter 13 attorney.

4. On January 11, 2018, I filed a legal malpractice complaint against Mr. Williams in state court on behalf of Mr. Cannon. If the state court dismisses the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the *Barton* doctrine, the statute of limitations may bar Mr. Cannon from refile in the Eastern District bankruptcy court. Due to the

1 uncertainty of the *Barton* doctrine, and the irreparable harm to Mr. Cannon should his  
2 claims become time barred, I previously filed a federal complaint prior to the instant  
3 application to reopen the bankruptcy case. Soon thereafter, I will file a motion seeking a  
4 determination of whether the *Barton* doctrine applies, and if so the Court's leave to proceed  
5 with the state court litigation.

6         5. I am mindful of the Court's busy docket and would not have filed the instant  
7 application and the complaint if I did not believe it was necessary to protect the interests of  
8 my client.

9  
10         I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America  
11 that the forgoing is true and correct.

12  
13 Dated: January 16, 2018

**MAKAREM & ASSOCIATES, APLC**

14  
15 By: /s/ Ronald W. Makarem

Ronald W. Makarem

16 Attorneys for Debtor JAMES CANNON  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28